

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

23rd Year of Publication
The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXIII, No. 9

P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015

© May 15, 1993

Champions of Science Scarce as Funds Grow Tight

As the Clinton Administration swings national research policy and resources toward technology deemed relevant to quick economic growth, what's notable is the feeble response of the basic-science community, which Clinton is squeezing to finance the turnaround.

It is not that there is an absence of yelps or doleful pronouncements about the penalties of neglecting science. The science establishment has refined whining and doomsaying to the point where an expression of satisfaction from this quarter would evoke broad astonishment. Indeed, Washington routinely resounds with scientific grievances. At present, particularly loud cries are emanating from the biomedical community, for which the recurrent nightmare of no-growth has finally materialized in a backsliding budget for the National Institutes of Health.

Government-wide, basic research was budgeted by Clinton for a 3 percent increase in fiscal 1994, while "civilian

Gallo Appeals Misconduct Case—P.4

Roster of US Science Attachés—P.5

applied research" was to rise by 6 percent. But that was before filibustering Republicans derailed Clinton's Economic Stimulus Package, which contained \$207 million for the National Science Foundation. A salvage effort for that item is under way, but the outlook is fairly bleak, given the mounting reverence for deficit reduction as a prelude to spending increases. The capital's science leaders and their constituents have good reason to feel unappreciated and slighted.

However, forget their raucous complaints, which are regularly discounted as part of the capital's normal background clatter. The telling dearth for science is an absence of politically effective representation, conniving, and influence, lacks that can be traced to several causes:

First, there's the very slow-paced changing of the guard from Bush to Clinton appointees, in the research agencies, as well as in other parts of the government. As a result, four months into the Clinton Administration, the federal establishment is riddled with senior vacancies and lame-duck Bush holdovers, who carry no weight on Capitol Hill or at the White House.

Emblematic of the languor is the case of Philip Lee, of the University of California at San Francisco. On March 12, the White House announced its intention to nominate him for the

top research- and health-policy post in the Department of Health and Human Services, Assistant Secretary for Health, with authority over the Public Health Service, which includes NIH, the Food and Drug Administration, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and various other agencies. As of May 11, Lee's nomination had not been sent to the Senate. Meanwhile, he's been on board at the Department as a consultant, a status that lacks authority and requires that he remain inconspicuous until the Senate approves his nomination.

The political frailty of science can also be attributed to a long succession of fat years on the federal dole, a comfy situation that provided little incentive for the science estab-

(Continued on Page 2)

In Brief

Ordered to give up misconduct studies and report for conventional duties at NIH, Ned Feder and Walter Stewart are taking annual leave while hunting for a law firm to represent them. Meanwhile, the voluminous files accumulated by the pair over the past decade have been sealed up by NIH security forces in their former workspace in the basement of Building 8 on the Bethesda campus. Stewart calls it "the Tutankhamen solution."

The Ad Hoc Group for Medical Research Funding, a perennial alliance in quest of bigger budgets for NIH, has partially yielded to political reality. In April, in its first response to Clinton's sparse budget for NIH, it called for \$1 billion atop the \$10.6 billion proposed by the White House for fiscal 1994. But in letters last week to members of the House Appropriations Committee, the Group said \$400 million would suffice to keep NIH on an even level.

Of the 5985 doctoral degrees in engineering awarded by American universities in 1992, 51.8 percent were received by persons who were neither US citizens nor permanent residents, according to a report by the American Association of Engineering Societies. Women received 15.7 percent of the bachelor's degrees, 15.5 percent of the master's, and 9.9 percent of the doctorates.

Give credit where due: Last year, 5 women were among the 60 members elected to the National Academy of Sciences. This year, the venerable institution continued its crawl out of the dark ages by including 6 women in the new crop of 60 members. The total active membership now numbers 1683, of whom 76 are women. Since its founding in 1863, the Academy has elected a total of 92 women.

... No Scientific Figure Commands National Attention

(Continued from Page 1)

lism to cultivate political skills and alliances. With the exception of the high-energy physicists, who cut their political teeth on nuclear-weapons issues, the leadership of science doesn't know how to forage in politically difficult terrain.

Finally, the contemporary scientific community is notably lacking in esteemed figures whose pronouncements command the attention of the press, the public and politics. Such figures have actually been rare in science—Vannevar Bush and J. Robert Oppenheimer in the early postwar period; Jonas Salk, for a time a scientific folk hero; Nobelist James Watson, of double-helix renown; Rachel Carson in environmental matters, and perhaps a few others.

But curiously, in addressing the public, science today has no counterparts with the stature of General Colin Powell in military affairs, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan in fiscal matters, or even Microsoft's Bill Gates, the billionaire symbol of entrepreneurial hope.

When they speak on important matters, whether sensibly or not, these chieftains receive attention. In contrast, senior scientists regularly declaim on matters of science policy, particularly funding, without drawing much if any notice. It is doubtful that the man in the street could name a scientist. As for physicians, perhaps the best-known in America today is Dr. Jack Kevorkian, the so-called suicide doctor.

Though biomedical research surely has a great deal to do with the substance and economics of health care, the 500-member staff assembled by Mrs. Clinton to plan a health-care revolution was notably lacking in research scientists. It cannot be said that politics regards science as an interest to be courted.

Some generously see design in the torpor that continues to characterize the staffing of the Clinton Administration. With the research agencies under acting or departing chiefs, these political analysts calculate, the White House can set the agenda without fear of the subtle resistance that full-fledged directors can mobilize for reasons of policy, ego, or attachment to higher values.

Hidden design may be the explanation for the ragged hiring record of a President who pledged to "hit the ground running" on Inauguration Day. But the more likely explanation is confusion, inexperience, and ineptitude on the part of a cocky gang of provincials who remain baffled by the slick capital crowd they promised to tame.

The White House helplessly attributes the languid pace of appointments to a big backlog of FBI security checks, but fails to explain why it doesn't boot the FBI into action, starting with the ouster of the buffoon FBI Director it inherited from the Bush Administration. Presidential Science Advisor John Gibbons offered a dismaying perspective on the recruitment lag in April when he observed that, "The problem is that the FBI's budget has been squeezed, too. They've had to padlock their training academy, and they'd

like the world to know that, and I don't blame them.... [SGR, April 15]."

The National Science Foundation is headed on an acting basis by a Bush appointee, Frederick Bernthal, who stepped up from Deputy Director in April, upon the departure of Director Walter Massey for the University of California. When the White House finally lands a Director for NSF—Sandra Faber, an astronomy professor at UC Santa Cruz, has turned it down—many months will pass before the recruit is investigated and deemed properly antiseptic for federal service.

The same goes for the National Institutes of Health, where Director Bernadine Healy, upon being told in late February that she will not be retained in office, announced that she would leave when a successor is named but would not stay beyond June 30. In setting that timetable, Healy expressed hope that the long and difficult hiatus that preceded her appointment—20 months—would be avoided. Perhaps it will, but the Administration's record provides no basis for confidence.

Healy, alone among federal research administrators, had developed a public identity. She did so by championing women's health issues, exchanging harsh words with Rep. John Dingell, and cultivating a press ever on the lookout for a new hero or heroine. With her impressive professional record as physician and administrator, stylish appearance, and sharp tongue, she manifested a star quality that's rare for a scientist.

But she also collided with influential people on Capitol Hill. And though she is easily today's most articulate and dramatic speaker in behalf of science funding, the fact is that NIH fared poorly in money matters during her two years in Bethesda. Even Congress, traditionally the stalwart champion of NIH budget growth, turned against the agency in the final budget of the Bush Administration.

When NIH's clients railed about the neglect of their needs in Clinton's 1994 budget, Science Advisor Gibbons brushed off the matter with "NIH has been moving along pretty well. There's no retreat from interest in NIH, especially biomedical and biotechnology [research] at NIH. I

(Continued on Page 3)

© 1993, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher

Associate Publisher

Daniel S. Greenberg

Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager

Glen D. Grant

Published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, \$395.00 (two years, \$670.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

... Politicians Are Preoccupied with Other Problems

(Continued from Page 2)

think we ought to look to the '95 budget to see how that's going to grow [SGR, April 15]."

Isn't Gibbons, as Presidential Science Advisor, supposed to be the champion of the scientific community? Many scientists naively think the role comes with the job, since Gibbons, as did his predecessors, frequently addresses scientific groups and pours them a bit of syrup. But in reality, fealty to the President and his political goals comes first in science advising, and if it doesn't the Advisor is either ignored, as happened in the Johnson White House, or ousted, which was Nixon's solution. Gibbons works for a President whose reelection chances depend on a quick economic rejuvenation. Basic research has many virtues, but quick payoff is rarely among them.

NASA, which has traditionally provided public entertainment to justify its heavy calls on the US Treasury, has finally run out of public and political credibility. The latest downsizing exercise on the Space Station is merely a brief detour on the way to oblivion for that misbegotten venture. Grounding of the Space Shuttle fleet, which operates at \$450 million per trip, will take somewhat longer, but is also inevitable.

There will, of course, always be a big and costly US space program, since space is the best place for carrying out the communications and surveillance functions essential for a world power. But the old gung-ho NASA is long gone, and anything NASA and its friends have to say about the importance of scientific research is regarded as suspect in many circles. In the aftermath of Sputnik, space was the great political and cultural invigorator of science and education. Today, it's a familiar part of the landscape and not especially exciting for a public besieged by claims on its attention.

A search for champions of science on Capitol Hill produces sparse results. The most prominent is Chairman George Brown (D-Calif.) of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee. But, as recounted in SGR [May 1], the title of his Committee is bigger than its jurisdiction. And Brown's views are an eclectic melange of scientific enthusiasm laced with vintage Ludditism. In the Senate, no one has assumed the role of science solon long held by Al Gore.

The Presidency of the National Academy of Sciences comes with a pulpit that could be used for addressing the political community and the public on scientific issues. But NAS President Frank Press, retiring from that post on June 30 after 12 years in office, has made few public utterances in recent years.

The editorship of *Science*, the nation's leading general scientific journal, provides an editorial platform that could serve for rallying the ranks of science and informing the lay press of scientific concerns and vulnerabilities. Editor Daniel E. Koshland Jr., editor since 1985, earnestly strains to demonstrate intelligence and insight in his frequent editorials on science and public policy. But he rarely ever comes

across as better than a well-intended lightweight, and sometimes not even that. His thousands of words have had no detectable effect on relations between science and government.

Sitting atop NSF in a role akin to board of trustees is the National Science Board, a 24-member, Presidentially-appointed body that, by statute, was supposed to take a broad view of national science affairs. Though traditionally shunning that role as incompatible with NSF's relatively minor presence in federal scientific affairs, the Board has now and then decided to rethink the matter. Once again, the issue of the Board's role is on the agenda, this time as the result of a recommendation last fall by the Commission on the Future of NSF.

Could the National Science Board, with the prestige of a Presidentially-appointed membership, evolve into an influential voice for science? The outlook isn't clear, especially since the Clinton Administration is still pondering the future of another Presidentially-appointed science committee, the President's Council of Advisors for Science and Technology, an offshoot of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. Though PCAST hasn't met since Clinton took office, its legal life extends to the end of June. Science Advisor Gibbons says he's looking into various advisory mechanisms, including a role that might be played by the NSF's Board.

In its dealings with its principal patron, the US government, the scientific community today is leaderless, drifting, and at the mercy of political forces that are not especially attuned to the needs of science. Despite this grim diagnosis, it is important to recognize, however, that there is no political hostility to science, despite paranoid perceptions to the contrary.

Rather, political attention is concentrated elsewhere, in the comforting assumption that science is more or less okay and other problems deserve priority. The scientific community has complained a good deal, but has not shown that politicians are wrong and dangerously negligent in holding this view. And that explains why science, after many good years, can expect difficult times in the Clinton Administration.—DSG

Polish Science Counselor Dies

Hubert Romanowski, 45, Counselor for Science and Technology at the Polish Embassy in Washington since 1991, was killed in an automobile crash near Waverly, Tennessee, on May 7. An Embassy colleague riding with him, Andrej Jarecki, 60, Counselor for Cultural Affairs, died of injuries shortly afterwards.

An Embassy spokeswoman told SGR that the two were en route to the University of Arkansas to discuss a cooperative program with Warsaw University. According to a police report, their car skidded on a wet surface on Interstate 40 and struck a tree.

5 Misconduct Charges to Be Heard at Gallo Appeal

The case of Robert Gallo came out of the investigative mill last year with one heavy-duty count of scientific misconduct and four lesser charges arising from his AIDS research at the National Institutes of Health.

Now, through legal necromancy, the lesser counts have been transmuted into the equivalent of charges of scientific misconduct—the most heinous rating in the government's hierarchy of scientific misdeeds. Gallo thus faces five charges of scientific misconduct in an appeal hearing scheduled for July 13 before the Departmental Appeals Board of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

The transformation is the result of legal wrangling among three parties:

- Gallo's lawyer, who insisted that all the findings, major and lesser, are appealable;
- Lawyers for the HHS Office of Research Integrity (ORI), which produced the misconduct and lesser charges, who contended that the jurisdiction of the Appeals Board is limited to the sole finding of misconduct.
- The Research Integrity Adjudication Panel of the HHS Appeals Board, which ruled on March 9 that "the lesser charges are the functional equivalent of findings of scientific misconduct."

Whether the ruling is good or bad news for Gallo depends on the outcome of the hearing. In the best scenario for him, if the Board rejects the charges, Gallo is absolved of all wrongdoing charged by ORI. At the other extreme, he could emerge from the hearing on the wrong end of five charges of scientific misconduct.

The possible penalties if any of the charges are upheld range widely. ORI, after ruling Gallo guilty of scientific misconduct and four lesser offenses, recommended, in effect, merely that NIH keep an eye on its star AIDS researcher. But the range of punishment could extend to denial of research support and even ouster from federal service.

Exoneration by the Board would be a triumph for the long-embattled Gallo, who insists that he is the target of malign ignoramuses. But any finding of guilt, even if accompanied by no more than an administrative slap, would be sorely humiliating for Gallo and would conform to the dark opinions many scientists hold about his glory-seeking tactics in research.

Though many allegations were hurled at Gallo in connection with his claims of priority in AIDS research, the ORI investigators ruled that he crossed the line into scientific misconduct only when he reported that a virus isolated at the Pasteur Institute, LAV, had not been transmitted to a permanent cell line. Terming this a "misrepresentation," ORI asserted that the claim "had the potential to impede the rapid advancement of research efforts with LAV"—in effect, a finding that Gallo delayed AIDS research.

While concluding that Gallo's behavior in this instance constituted "scientific misconduct," the ORI also stated that other "actions reflect a pattern of conduct that must be

censured even though they do not constitute scientific misconduct." ORI sorted the censurables into four items. In the first, regarding publication, ORI termed him guilty of "gratuitous, self-serving, and improper" behavior, adding that Gallo's actions demonstrated a "propensity to misrepresent in favor of his own research findings or hypotheses."

The second accused him of "substantial responsibility for the numerous discrepancies in a paper" by a laboratory subordinate, Mikulas Popovic—scheduled to go before the Appeal Board June 7 to contest ORI's findings of misconduct in his case.

ORI also ruled that Gallo should be censured for "careless and unacceptable keeping of research records" and "irresponsible laboratory management."

Finally, and perhaps most serious—though not ruled misconduct—ORI charged Gallo with the "imposition of restrictive conditions" on the distribution of cell lines and "indifference ... to sharing of research materials of critical public health importance."

Gallo denies the charge, but documents obtained by SGR show that he routinely imposed restrictions on the use of cell lines requested in the mid-1980s by other researchers. A form letter from Gallo, specifying conditions for receiving the H9/HTLV-IIIB cell line from his laboratory, states, "Work performed will be on a collaborative basis with Dr. Gallo and one or more members of his laboratory..."

Another form states, "Work with HTLV-VIII will not be published without prior approval by Dr. Gallo."

On May 14, 1984, the cell line was requested in a letter from a colleague at NIH, Malcolm A. Martin, Chief of the Laboratory of Molecular Microbiology, at the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases.

On June 22, 1984, Gallo replied that "the uninfected HT cell lines are still being characterized for the first detailed publication on them. Therefore, they are not generally available now...." Noting that he could provide Martin with "HTLV-III producing cells lines," Gallo stated, "Please let me know your wishes, and I would also appreciate it if you let me know what you plan to do with the uninfected cells. For instance, I do not think it would be appropriate for you to put the French isolate in them. That is for them to do in collaboration with me and my co-workers and is ongoing."

In ruling that the lesser charges are within the jurisdiction of the Appeals Board, Cecilia Sparks Ford, of the Board's Research Integrity Adjudication Panel, stated:

"Given the language used by ORI in its report, ORI clearly found the censurable conduct to seriously deviate from practices it would accept. Thus, these findings fall squarely within a definition of scientific misconduct formally adopted by the Public Health Service."

"In sum," Ford continued, "I conclude that the findings of censurable conduct are in substance findings of scientific misconduct and that the substance, not the label, controls for purposes of Board jurisdiction." —DSG

Science Aides at US Embassies: A Worldwide Roster

Every few years (last on October 15, 1991), SGR lists the attaches and counselors for Environment, Science, and Technology (EST) posted at US Embassies and Missions around the world. Little-known back home, they can be useful for linking up with sci/tech individuals and organizations abroad, but their responsiveness varies according to personal inclination, workload, and reasonableness of requests. Attempts to enlist them as tourist guides should be made only by those possessing or connected to high rank.

Local addresses of the Embassies are given for each capital. However, the State Department says the preferred means of mailing is through Army Post Office (APO) or Fleet Post Office (FPO) addresses, which are listed after the local addresses; just the letters and numbers suffice, says State. The list is said to be current as of May 11. (Coming soon: foreign science and technology attaches and counselors at embassies in Washington).

Argentina. Paul C. Maxwell, EST Counselor, US Embassy, 4300 Columbia, 1425, Buenos Aires.

APO AA 34034. Tel. (54) (1) 774-7611/8811/9911.

Belgium. Steven Noble, EST Counselor, US Mission to the European Communities, 40 Blvd. du Regent, B-1000 Brussels.

APO AE 09724. Tel. (32) (2) 513-4450; fax 511-2092.

Brazil. Leroy Simpkins, EST Counselor, US Embassy, Avenida Das Nacoes, Lot 3, Brasilia.

APO AA 34030. Tel. (55) (61) 225-9894, 321-7272; fax 225-9136.

Canada. Thomas J. Wajda, EST Counselor, US Embassy, 100 Wellington St., K1P 5T1 Ottawa.

PO Box 5000, Ogdensburg, NY 13669-0430. Tel. (613) 238-5335/238-4470; fax 234-2588.

Chile. Norman Banks, EST Attaché, US Embassy, Codina Building, 1343 Agustinas, Santiago.

APO AA 34033. Tel. (56) (2) 671-0133; fax 699-1141.

China. Andres D. Onate, EST Counselor; Marco di Capua, EST Attaché, US Embassy, XIU SHUI BEI JIE 3, 100600, PSC 461, Box 50, Beijing.

FPO AP 96521-0002. Tel. (86) (1) 532-3831; fax 532-3178.

Czech Republic. Rodney L. Huff, EST Counselor, US Embassy, TRZISTE 15, 125 48 Prague 1; Unit 25402, Czech Republic.

APO AE 09213-5630. Tel. (42) (2) 536-641/6; after hours, 536-646; fax 532-457.

France. Michael A.G. Michaud, EST Counselor; Lynette Poulton, EST Officer, US Embassy, 2 Avenue Gabriel, 75382 Paris, Cedex 08, Unit 21551.

APO AE 09777. Tel. (33) (1) 42-96-12-02, 42-61-80-75; fax 42-66-97-83.

Germany. Richard Ries, EST Counselor, US Embassy, Deichmanns Aue, 5300 Bonn 2.

APO AE 09080. Tel. (49) (228) 3391; fax 339-2663.

Hungary. Lawrence Cohen, EST Attaché, US Embassy, V. Szabadsag Ter 12, Budapest.

APO AE 09213-5270. Tel. (36) (1) 112-6450; fax 132-8934.

India. Peter L.M. Heydemann, EST Counselor, US Embassy, Shanti Path, Chanakyapuri 110021, New Delhi.

American Embassy New Delhi, Department of State, Wash-

ington, DC 20521-9000. Tel. (91) (11) 600651; fax 671581, 6872028.

Indonesia. Sidney Smith, EST Counselor, US Embassy, Medan Merdeka Selatan 5, Jakarta.

APO AP 96520. Tel. (62) (21) 360-360; fax 386-2259.

Israel. David Mullenex, EST Attaché, US Embassy, 71 Hayarkon St., Tel Aviv.

APO AE 09830. Tel. (972) (3) 632034; fax 663449.

Italy. Gregory Dunn, EST Counselor; Anthony A. Pahigian, EST Officer, US Embassy, Via Veneto 119/A, 00187, Rome.

APO AE 09624. Tel. (39) (6) 46741; fax 4674-2356.

Japan. Edward M. Malloy, EST Minister-Counselor; Michael McCabe, EST Officer, US Embassy, 10-5, Akasaka 1-chome, Minato-ku (107) Tokyo.

Unit 45004, Box 258, APO AP 96337-0001. Tel. (81) (3) 3224-5000; fax 3505-1862.

Korea. Kenneth D. Cohen, EST Counselor, US Embassy, 82 Sejong-Ro, Chongro-ku, Seoul.

AMEMB, Unit 15550, APO AP 96205-0001. Tel. (82) (2) 732-2601-18; fax 738-8845.

Mexico. S. Ahmed Meer, EST Counselor; Richard S. Taylor, EST Officer; Xiena Wilkinson, Fisheries Attaché, US Embassy, Paseo De La Reforma 305, Mexico City.

PO Box 3087, Laredo, Texas, 78044-3087. Tel. (52) (5) 211-0042; fax 511-9980, 208-3373.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Daniel Dolan, EST Counselor, US Mission, OECD, 19 Rue de Franqueville, 75016 Paris.

APO AE 09777. Tel. (33) (1) 45-24-74-77; fax 45-24-74-80.

Poland. Coleman J. Nee, EST Counselor, US Embassy, Aleje Ujazdowskie 29/31, Warsaw.

Box 5010, APO AE 09213-5010. Tel. (48) (2) 628-3041; fax 628-1172, 628-9326.

Russia. Robert Clarke, EST Counselor, US Embassy, Ulitsa Chaykovskogo 19/21/23, Moscow.

APO AE 09721. Tel. (7) (095) 252-2450/59.

Slovakia. Chris Sandrolini, EST Officer, US Embassy, Hviezdoslavovo Namesite 4, 81102, Bratislava, Box 5630.

APO AE 09213-5630. Tel. (42) (7) 330861; fax 335439.

Spain. Helen Lane, EST Counselor, US Embassy, Serrano 75, 28006, Madrid.

APO AE 09642. Tel. (34) (1) 577-4000; fax 575-8655.

Taiwan. Della Knox-Bennett, Clarke N. Ellis, Taiwan Liaison Officers, American Institute in Taiwan.

Taipei: #7 Lane 134, Hsin Yi Road, Section 3, Taipei. Tel. (886) (2) 709-2000; fax 702-7675.

Kaohsiung: 3d Floor, #2 Chung Cheng 3rd Road, Kaohsiung. Tel. (886) (7) 224-0154/7; fax 223-8237.

US Address: Room 1705, 1700 N. Moore St., Arlington, Va. 22209-1996. Tel. (703) 525-8474; fax 841-1385.

American Institute Pouch Address: AIT/Taipei, Department of State, Washington, DC 20521-4170.

United Kingdom. Jeffrey Lutz, EST Counselor; Edgar Hildebrand, EST Officer, US Embassy, 24/31 Grosvenor Square W1A 1AE.

PSC 801, Box 40, FPO AE 09498-4040. Tel. (44) (71) 408-8038; fax 409-1637.

Yugoslavia. Post of EST Officer has been vacant since June 1992.

In Quotes: Hard Times for Behavioral Science

From a statement by Alan G. Kraut, Executive Director of the American Psychological Society, May 3, to the National Academy of Sciences Committee on National Needs for Biomedical and Behavioral Research Personnel, which advises the National Institutes of Health on training programs.

There will be little, if any, new money for research or new researchers for the next several years. The sad irony in this lack of funding is that it is coming as behavioral science has made major strides.

Consider some evidence. In the last few years, the National Science Foundation gave the behavioral sciences their own structure; the National Institutes of Health significantly increased their commitment to behavioral research; the National Institute of Mental Health is undertaking an assessment of behavioral science that should result in a national plan that in richer days would have increased behavioral funding at NIMH the same way other reports increased NIMH support of schizophrenia and neuroscience; and, finally, Congress has asked other federal

agencies to look toward a multi-organizational effort aimed at creating a national behavioral science research agenda, called the Human Capital Initiative, in planning their behavioral research priorities....

The NIH leadership generally takes a narrow view of behavioral science, seeing it in terms of application without acknowledging basic research. They call on behavioral science to change lifestyles—to stop smoking or to convince women to come in for mammograms—while they underemphasize basic behavioral research on issues like how children develop, how basic processes of learning and thinking take place, or what is the nature of the interaction between behavior and biology—areas that need to be investigated before application. Yet, these leaders make the assumption that if an illness has a biological basis, then basic biological research is going to pay off eventually in treatment, prevention, and even cure.

We need to encourage the same assumption on the behavioral side. If there is a behavioral component to a disorder, we need to invest in basic behavioral research if we hope to intervene effectively.

Job Changes & Appointments

Roger C. Herdman, a physician who has headed the Health and Life Sciences Division at the Office of Technology Assessment since 1984, has been elected Director of OTA by the agency's Congressional Board. He succeeds John Gibbons, longtime OTA chief who became White House science and technology advisor at the outset of the Clinton Administration. Herdman, who had been serving as OTA's Acting Director, was elected for the standard six-year term.

Rafe Pomerance, Senior Associate for Policy Affairs at the World Resources Institute (WRI), has been appointed Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Environment, Health and Natural Resources. **Jessica Tuchman Mathews**, WRI Vice President, has been appointed Deputy Under Secretary in State's Bureau of Global Affairs, a new organization the Department is assembling from various scattered activities.

Radford Byerly Jr. has resigned as Chief of Staff of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee (SS&T) to become Vice President of the University Corporation for Atmospheric Physics and first Director of the Walter Orr Roberts Institute, both in Boulder, Colorado. He will be succeeded by **Robert E. Palmer**, a marine biologist who has held various Committee staff posts since 1980, most recently Senior Policy Coordinator.

Also at the SS&T Committee: **Pete Didisheim**, Deputy Chief of Staff, is on leave of absence to serve as Special Assistant for Science and Technology at the Department of Energy. **Keith Laughlin** has stepped down as Staff Director of the SS&T Investigations and Oversight Subcommittee to join the White House Office of Environmental Policy. In an

unusual switch, he's been succeeded by **Dan Pierson**, previously the staff chief for the Republican minority on the Subcommittee.

J. Clifford Schoep, Staff Vice President-Technology at General Dynamics, has been appointed President and Chief Operating Officer of the National Center for Advanced Technologies, succeeding **John Swihart**, who becomes Vice Chairman. The Center was established in 1989 by the Aerospace Industries Association to orchestrate research and development on key technologies by government, academe, and industry.

Marc H. Brodsky, a researcher and former administrator at IBM, has been appointed Director and Chief Executive Officer of the American Institute of Physics (AIP), succeeding **Kenneth W. Ford**, who plans to retire in October after seven years in the post. AIP, umbrella organization for 10 societies, with total membership of about 100,000, plans to move in November from New York City to a new headquarters, the American Center for Physics, at College Park, Md.

David W. Hennage has been appointed Executive Director of the Optical Society of America, succeeding the retiring **Jarus Quinn** at the 12,000-member organization, headquartered in Washington, DC. Hennage formerly served as Vice President and Chief Operating Officer of the Chicago Museum of Science and Industry.

Martin Apple has been appointed Executive Director of the Council of Scientific Society Presidents, Washington-based association of scientific and technical organizations. He succeeds **John Holmfeld**, who quit to do some writing. Apple formerly was Managing Partner of Leaders, a Washington consulting firm and previously was on the faculty of the University of California, San Francisco.

More IN PRINT: Animal Policy, Engineering Education

(Continued from Page 8)

Animal Policy Report: Newsletter on Animal and Environmental Issues (quarterly, \$20), aided by the Pew Charitable Trusts, an upgrade of an existing publication of the Center for Animals and Public Policy at the Tufts University School of Veterinary Medicine. Edited by Andrew N. Rowan, Director of the Center, the newsletter presents itself as a forum for promoting dialog between the "animal protection movement and its opponents," with the parties described as making "liberal use of slogans and name-calling while talking past their opponents directly to the public." The spring issue (6 pp.) contains news and commentary, reports of meetings, publications, etc.

Order from: Center for Animals and Public Policy, Tufts University School of Veterinary Medicine, 200 Westboro Road, North Grafton, Massachusetts 01536; tel. 508/839-7991.

Issues in Engineering Education (6 pp., no charge), an earnest, amateurish-looking quarterly newsletter from the National Academy of Sciences Board on Engineering Education. Established in 1991 to stir up the field, the Board is chaired by Karl Pister, Chancellor, UC Santa Cruz, and consists of 25 members from academe, industry, and government. The newsletter, described as "A Bulletin Addressing Culture Change in Engineering Education," is now in its second year of publication. The latest issue contains a brief article by Samuel Florman, a Board member who is Vice President of a construction company, and excerpts from papers at meetings sponsored by the Board.

Order from: National Academy of Sciences, Board on Engineering Education, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20418; tel. 202/334-2192; fax 202/334-2482.

Extending the Frontiers of Science (32 pp., no charge), from the Carnegie Institution of Washington, a rare, maybe pathbreaking, venture in institutional narcissism: An assemblage of press clippings, from 1980-92, about the research activities at the laboratories of the privately endowed Carnegie. "This review is unusual in that we present ourselves not in our own words but as others see us," writes Carnegie President Maxine Singer in an introduction to the slick-paper, spiral-bound collection of newspaper and magazine articles.

Praising "the journalists who have chosen the difficult life's work of reporting science news to a public interested in, but often poorly prepared to comprehend new discoveries," Singer concludes: "We interpret the message that emerges from their words to confirm our most basic conviction—that our scientists are contributing to society to an extent vastly out of proportion to the institution's size and budget." Intended for fundraising, the publication is available to the general public in limited quantities.

Order from: Carnegie Institution of Washington, Office of Administration, 1530 P St. NW, Washington, DC 20005; tel. 202/387-6411.

geneWatch (12 pp., \$30 for institutions, \$24 for individuals, \$15 "for low income and/or students"), bimonthly bulletin of the Council for Responsible Genetics, a fount of rare skepticism and informed concern about the many wondrous claims showered on the public by the genetics-research industry. The March issue discusses reports of "gay genes," genetic criteria in the job market, and legislative developments concerning biotechnology. Included, too, are book reviews, meeting schedules, and lists of recent publications. The Board of the Council is chaired by Sheldon Krimsky, Tufts University, and includes Jonathan King, MIT, and Ruth Hubbard, Harvard.

Order from: Council for Responsible Genetics, 5 Upland Road, Cambridge, Mass. 02140; tel. 617/868-0870; fax 617/491-5344.

The Clinton Administration's 100 Day Report: Department of Energy Accomplishments (22 pp., no charge), actually, close to nothing new was accomplished at DOE by the meaningless milestone of Clinton's first 100 days, though proposals for major shifts from military to civilian and from nuclear to renewables are pending in Congress. But DOE, always inventive, manages to pad out the "accomplishments" list with scores of items, including: "DOE hosted a nationwide 'Science Bowl' competition among high school teams of future scientists and engineers. Secretary O'Leary addressed the students after the contest and encouraged them to pursue their scientific skills, and to motivate their fellow students." Also cited: "Controlling spending while improving services to the public."

Order from: DOE, Public Inquiries Branch, Washington, DC 20585; tel. 202/586-5575.

To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report

Northwest Station, Box 6226A

Washington, D.C. 20015

Renew my subscription Enter my subscription

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$395.00
two years, \$670.00

Non-USA airmail, \$35.00 per year; non-USA surface mail
\$15.00 per year additional

Check enclosed Please Bill

Please charge to MasterCard VISA

Account# _____ Exp.date _____

Signature _____

Name _____

Address _____

Zip _____

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054 / FAX: (202) 362-2790

IN PRINT: OTA Catalog, Defense Conversion, Etc.

The publications listed are obtainable as indicated—not from SGR.

Catalog of OTA Publications (OTA-P-58; 36 pp., no charge), 20th anniversary inventory of the Office of Technology Assessment, listing hundreds of the reports it has produced for Congressional committees on a wide range of subjects, including federal R&D policy, aging, energy, agriculture, health care, and virtually everything else of legislative concern. Included are instructions for ordering from the various sources that carry OTA materials.

Order from: US Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, Washington, DC 20510-8025; tel. 202/224-8996; fax 202/228-6098.

Program Information Package for Defense Technology Conversion, Reinvestment, and Transition Assistance (no charge), provides details about the Clinton Administration's aspirations to invigorate the economy by shifting several hundred million dollars in R&D funds into hot technologies. Included are the names and telephone numbers of officials in the agencies involved: the Pentagon's newly refocused Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA, now shorn of "Defense" as the first word of its title), the research arms of the military services, the Department of Energy, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NASA, and NSF. Subject areas listed range far and wide, and include "vehicle technology," "health care technology," "electronics designs and manufacturing," and "environment technology." Parts of the package supersede materials distributed at regional briefings last month.

Order from: Technology Reinvestment Project, 3701 N. Fairfax Drive, Arlington, Va. 22203-1714; tel. 1/800-DUAL-USE.

CIA Maps and Publications Released to the Public (85 pp., no charge), latest catalog (dated April 1992, with a supplement dated December 1992) from a federal agency that expends no effort to make known the availability of some of its output. The catalog, however, is available upon request. Listed are hundreds of maps, economic and political studies, directories of national officials, etc., dating from the early 1970s to 1992. There are bits on space and energy, but otherwise little on R&D-related topics, though the CIA has long put a lot of effort into monitoring that area. Included are prices and instructions for ordering materials.

Order from: Central Intelligence Agency, Office of Public and Agency Information, Washington, DC 20505; tel. 703/351-2053.

Teaching and Research (ORAU93/C-9; 27 pp., no charge), from Oak Ridge Associated Universities, a consortium of 65 institutions of higher education affiliated with the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, a professorial salvo in support of teaching and research as mutually beneficial enterprises—a

formulation that the Oak Ridgers consider in danger. Under the title "A Mission Under Fire," a prefatory note states that "in the wake of sensational stories about research fraud and financial impropriety, the debate has become even more focused, the topic apparently now being: *Resolved:* that research by university professors undermines the quality and effectiveness of their teaching." By whom this has been resolved is not stated, but offered in refutation are statements by some 40 academics in member universities.

Order from: Oak Ridge Associated Universities, Office of Information Services, PO Box 117, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831-0117; tel. 615/576-3146.

FY 1994 Budgets for Social and Behavioral Science Research (36 pp.), annual federal budget-analysis issue of the biweekly newsletter *COSSA Washington Update*, published by the Consortium of Social Science Associations, national monitor and pleader for these poor relations at the federal trough (\$10 for the budget issue; annual subscriptions: \$60 for individuals; \$120 for institutions). The analysis, focused on the budget that the Clinton Administration submitted in April for fiscal year 1994 (beginning next October 1), covers the federal agencies, large and small, that support social and behavioral research. COSSA reports sighting a few increases, notably for the collection of economic data by the Census Bureau and for research support by NSF's Directorate for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences. But, in most federal agencies, COSSA's constituents face the same sluggish economy that afflicts the so-called hard sciences. And as anti-deficit passions grow in Congress, the recommended increases become less certain. Addressing NIH's support of behavioral research, COSSA observes: "As lofty as NIH's commitment to health and behavior research appears ... it is not substantiated by this year's funding request from the Administration."

Order from: Consortium of Social Science Associations, 1522 K St. NW, Suite 836, Washington, DC 20005; tel. 202/842-3525; fax 202/842-2788.

Organ Transplants: Increased Effort Needed to Boost Supply and Ensure Equitable Distribution of Organs (GAO/HRD-93-56; 94 pp., no charge), by the General Accounting Office (GAO), says the shortfall in the supply of human organs for transplants continues to grow, with some 10,000 deaths of patients on transplant waiting lists reported in a recent five-year period. The GAO raises the issue of equity in allocation of organs, noting that some organ-collecting organizations serve only a single center. The report also observes that the Department of Health and Human Services has failed to fulfill statutory requirements to monitor transplant activities.

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20884-6015; tel. 202/512-6000; fax 301/258-4066.

(Continued on Page 7)

